

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Response to Final Office Action of May 23, 2005

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 23, 2005 wherein the Examiner:

(i) rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniels et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0083794) ("Daniels");

(ii) rejected claim 10 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 13, and 14 of copending Application 10/458,716 (Daniels U.S. Pub. No. US 2004/0083794);

(iii) objected to claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and

(iv) allowed claims 13 and 14.

Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Final Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicants have amended claims 2-8, 11-12 and 16-20, and have canceled claims 1, 10 and 15. All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Response to Final Office Action of May 23, 2005

In the Final Office Action, Examiner has indicated that claims 3, 11 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended these claims as indicated by Examiner, and respectfully submit that claims 3, 11 and 18 are now in condition for allowance. Because claims 2, 4-9, 12, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are all dependent on the allowable claims, these claims should also be allowable. Further, the Examiner indicated in the Final Office Action that claims 13 and 14 are allowed. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicants have made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Final Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7570.

Applicants believe there are no fees due for this document, however, if any fees are due, the Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/655,985
Attorney Docket: 46107-0091
Response to Final Office Action of May 23, 2005

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Date: July 25, 2005

By: M.A. Schaldenbrand
Michael A. Schaldenbrand
Reg. No. 47,923

Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
(248) 433-7570

MAS/
BLOOMFIELD 46107-91 696193v1